



1           The judgment of the district court is reversed. This case is remanded with  
2           instructions to grant the writ unless the State of Nevada elects to pursue a new trial within  
3           a reasonable amount of time.

4           *Riley*, 786 F.3d at 727. The mandate of the court of appeals has been spread upon the record in this case,  
5           but the court has not yet entered a judgment pursuant to the court of appeals' instructions.

6           On May 16, 2016, respondents filed a "Motion for Rule 60(B) Relief from Judgment" (ECF  
7           No. 232). In that motion, respondents "move, pursuant to FRCP 60(b), for relief from this Court's  
8           judgment and/or order entered on May 10, 2016." *See* Motion for Rule 60(b) Relief (ECF No. 232),  
9           p. 1.

10          There is not now a final judgment in the case. The court of appeals reversed the judgment entered  
11          on September 20, 2010, and remanded for this court to issue *Riley* a writ of habeas corpus. This court  
12          has not yet entered a new judgment issuing the writ. So, to the extent respondents seek relief from a  
13          judgment pursuant to Rule 60(b), their motion is premature. Furthermore, in the order entered by this  
14          court on May 10, 2016, the court simply ordered the court of appeals' mandate spread upon the record.  
15          *See* Order entered May 10, 2016 (ECF No. 231). To the extent respondents seek relief from the  
16          May 10 order, their motion is without merit; respondents point to no alleged error in the order spreading  
17          the court of appeals' mandate on the record. The court will, therefore, deny respondents' motion.

18          The court will set a schedule for counsel to meet and confer regarding the form of a proposed  
19          order granting *Riley* habeas corpus relief pursuant to the order of the court of appeals, and for *Riley* to  
20          then file a proposed order, and for respondents to respond, and *Riley* to reply, if necessary.

21          **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that respondents' Motion for Rule 60(B) Relief from  
22          Judgment (ECF No. 232) is **DENIED**.

23          **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, within 20 days from the entry of this order, counsel for the  
24          petitioner and counsel for the respondents shall meet and confer regarding the terms of a proposed order  
25          granting the petitioner habeas corpus relief pursuant to the order of the court of appeals.

26          ///


///

1       **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, after counsel meet and confer, and within 30 days from the  
2 entry of this order, petitioner shall file a proposed order granting him habeas corpus relief pursuant to  
3 the order of the court of appeals.

4       **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, after petitioner files the proposed order, respondents may,  
5 if necessary, file a response within ten days, and then, if necessary, petitioner may file a reply within seven  
6 days.

7       **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d), the Clerk  
8 of the Court shall substitute Renee Baker for E.K. McDaniel, on the docket, as the respondent warden,  
9 and shall substitute Adam Paul Laxalt for Frankie Sue Del Papa, on the docket, as the respondent  
10 Attorney General of the State of Nevada, and shall update the caption of the action to reflect those  
11 changes.

12  
13       Dated this 25th day of May, 2016.

14  
15         
16       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26